`IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.14674 of 2006

Dated: July 18, 2006

Between:

R. Nanda Kishore, S/o. Durga Rao, age about 36 years,
LIC of India, Branch Office, Vinukonda, Guntur District.

… Petitioner

And

LIC of India, rep. by its Zonal Manager,
South Central Zone, Hyderabad, and others.

… Respondents

Order:

This writ petition has been filed seeking Mandamus to declare the action of the respondents in issuing proceedings dated 30-03-2005 as unconstitutional and for a consequential direction to the respondents to close the issue by dropping all the charges levelled against the petitioner.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents.

3. The petitioner, an Assistant in the Life Insurance Corporation of India, was issued proceedings dated 30-03-2005 by the second respondent herein alleging that he is spoiling the atmosphere in the office by bringing outside influence in office matters and was called upon to submit his explanation. It is alleged that though the petitioner has submitted his explanation to the impugned proceedings on 01-04-2005, no action whatsoever is being taken.

4. Sri K.S. Murthy, the learned counsel for the petitioner, contends that the petitioner was transferred from Jaggaiahpet to Vinukonda by proceedings dated 30-04-2005 referring to some complaint, made against him. He further submits that pursuant to the proceedings dated 30-03-2005; no orders have been passed by the respondents.

5. It is to be noticed that no order has been passed against the petitioner, casting stigma on him and no punishment has been imposed on him by the impugned proceedings. Some allegations were levelled against him and he was asked to submit his explanation. Merely because the petitioner has submitted his explanation, he cannot seek directions to the respondents to close the issue and drop the charges on the ground that no orders have been communicated to him. So far as transfer of the petitioner is concerned, it is a separate issue, which is not subject matter of this writ petition and the same has been effected as early as in April, 2005. In that view of the matter, I do not find any illegality in the action of the respondents to grant the relief as prayed for.

6. The writ petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

July 18, 2006
MRR